



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

M

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/863,006	05/22/2001	Gene W. Zdenek	PRES06-00208	7499

7590

06/20/2003

NOVAKOV DAVIS & MUNCK
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
900 THREE GALLERIA TOWER
13155 NOEL ROAD
DALLAS, TX 75240

EXAMINER

MATTHEWS, WILLIAM H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3738

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2003

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/863,006

Applicant(s)

ZDENEK ET AL.

Examiner

William H. Matthews (Howie)

Art Unit

3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4,7-9,12,16 and 19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,6,10,11,13-15,17,18 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: "Including" should read --includes--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 5, and 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pynson et al US PN 5,879,319.

Pynson et al. discloses in figures 1-4 a prosthesis meeting the structural limitations of claims 1-3, 5, and 6 and capable of performing the intended use limitations in lines 12-19 of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 10,11,13-15,17,18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith RE 35,390 in view of Memmen US PN 5,370,607.

Smith '390 discloses a prosthesis meeting all structural limitations of claims 10,11,13-15,17,18, and 20 in figures 2-4 or figures 5-7, but Smith lacks the express disclosure of the bottom surface having a curve. Note in lines 48-59 of column 3 that the Smith prosthesis may be made of a silicone hydrogel that could curve to the shape of the eye. However, Memmen teaches a prosthesis for implantation in the sclera wherein the prosthesis curves to the shape of the eye in order to maximize surface area contact for fluid transport functions (see lines 12-34 of col. 9).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the prosthesis disclosed by Smith by selecting a particular material or selecting a predetermined shape for the prosthesis in order to maximize surface area contact for fluid transport functions as taught by Memmen.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed March 31, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding arguments related to Pynson et al. US PN 5,879,319, Applicant contends that Pynson et al. lacks disclosure of the two intended use recitations in lines 12-19 of claim 1. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Pynson et al. device is clearly "adapted to expand a portion of a sclera proximate to the scleral pocket or tunnel..." because the mere placement of the device in a pocket or tunnel would cause

Art Unit: 3738

expansion of adjacent scleral tissue such as the scleral flap. Regarding the limitation "said end portion is adapted to rest on a portion of said sclera outside said scleral pocket or tunnel when said prosthesis is inserted within said scleral pocket or tunnel...", the Pynson et al. device is structurally capable of performing this intended use recitation and therefore anticipates the claim limitations. Both ends of the device are of rectangular shape and would serve to prevent rotation of the device when placed in a scleral pocket or tunnel.

Regarding arguments related to Smith Re. 35,390 in view of Memmen US PN 5,370,607, Applicant contends that Smith lacks disclosure of the device performing the intended use of expanding a portion of the sclera proximate to the scleral pocket or tunnel. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Smith device is clearly "adapted to expand a portion of a sclera proximate to the scleral pocket or tunnel..." because the mere placement of the device in a pocket or tunnel would cause expansion of adjacent scleral tissue such as the scleral flap. Furthermore, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a prosthesis adapted for insertion into a pocket in the sclera of an eye in the region of the ciliary body) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. Matthews (Howie) whose telephone number is 703-305-0316. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:00-4:30 (Every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine M. McDermott can be reached on 703-308-2111. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-2708 for regular communications and (703) 305-3590 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 3738

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

WHM

WHM

June 12, 2003

C2
CORRINE McDERMOTT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700